

acquaintance's wife, adding: "If every officer who is in love with his neighbor's wife is dismissed from the army, there would be very few left."

#### A FLIMSY STORY RIDDLED.

M. Labori took M. Dreyfus in hand and ascertained that he only knew that the visitor was a German attaché because he was told so, and he did not know whether he was a military or a civil attaché. He did not even know his name. In fact, the whole story was of the flimsiest description. Moreover, M. Labori brought out the fact that a foreign military attaché would have had nothing to gain by cultivating the acquaintance of a simple lieutenant, as Dreyfus was then.

Dreyfus, when he arose to reply to this witness, spoke in a quiet, convincing voice, denying that he had any relations with a German attaché, military or civil. M. Labori finished with M. Dreyfus referring to the production of his record in the Law Courts, which, counsel hinted, was discredited.

The prisoner was very indignant during M. Dreyfus's deposition, and once tried to interrupt, but the president of the court, Colonel Jouaust, waved him down, telling him that he had finished, and that he was the witness who was concluding, requesting an inquiry, and saying: "Because it must be made known here who is lying and who is speaking the truth." The statement of the prisoner caused a deep impression.

After the Dreyfus testimony, Captain Valentin deposed that at the end of May, 1896, Major Lauth came out of Colonel Picquart's room exclaiming:

"Ah! Ah! Never in this world!"

When the witness asked what was the matter, the Major replied:

"He wants me to certify that it is the handwriting of So-and-so. I will certify to nothing." The next witness, Captain Valentin, testified to seeing Maitre Leblais in Colonel Picquart's office at the beginning of 1896, and Captain Le Rond, at the beginning of 1896, connected Esterhazy with espionage. But Colonel Picquart confronted the witness and denied the allegation.

ESTERHAZY NOT ON HAND.

Esterhazy was called as a witness, but there was no response. The Court then ordered the reading of his testimony as given before the Court of Cassation. When this had been finished, M. Labori asked that Esterhazy's letters to the President of the Republic be read, in which Esterhazy is said to have threatened, if the scandal continued, that his sovereign, the Emperor, would intervene.

General Gouze then asked to be allowed to respond to Esterhazy's testimony as given before the Court of Cassation, and declared in a loud voice that Esterhazy's statement that he was the instrument of the General Staff was an absolute lie. The General traversed Esterhazy's testimony, contradicting statement after statement, and declaring that Esterhazy could only have had relations with Major Du Paty de Clam and the late Lieutenant Colonel Henry. The General absolutely denied having had any relations with him.

Counsel asked that the dossier containing the documents relating to the inquiry into the relations of Esterhazy and Du Paty de Clam instituted by Major Tavernier on behalf of the military authorities should be communicated to the Court and discussed. To this the Government Commissioner, Major Carrière, replied that he had applied to the military authorities on the subject, but his request had been refused. Major Carrière added that he hoped Du Paty de Clam would be able to come to court in a few days. A medical consultation in this connection would take place to-night, and the decision would be announced to-morrow.

Leading counsel then submitted to General Gouze a number of searching questions on Esterhazy's relations with the General Staff. The General, as a result, became very excited, especially when he was asked if there was not an intrigue in favor of Esterhazy and if he did not take part in it.

"It is false! It is false!" shouted the General, and, from his manner, one would imagine he spoke with sincerity, unless he is a fine actor. However, he was visibly disconcerted at several of M. Labori's questions. The witness's voice grew so faint that it was scarcely audible.

#### GONSE BLAMES SAUSSIER.

Finally, counsel asked why Esterhazy was not arrested after the inquiry, and General Gouze replied: "Because General Saussier deemed it proper to leave him at liberty."

"Yes," retorted M. Labori, "but General Saussier must have been deceived by the General Staff."

This abrupt declaration, accompanied by an expressive gesture, created a deep impression in court, amid which the General returned to his seat, looking very ill at ease.

Major Gendron, who deposed yesterday, was recalled after General Gouze, and supported the latter's statements.

General Boissière then jumped to his feet and denied in the most formal manner Esterhazy's statements, adding that he had been present when he would have "given him the lie with all the contempt he deserves."

The name of Mme. Pays was called, but as there was no response the testimony which she gave before the Court of Cassation was read.

General Lebelin de Dionne, a kind looking officer, then testified, but his looks did not coincide with his words, for he accused Dreyfus of having declared that the Alsations were happier under Germany than under France. Dreyfus, the witness also said, complained of his position at the School of War.

The prisoner replied vigorously to General Lebelin de Dionne, denying that he ever spoke of the Alsations as alleged, but admitting using hard words on account of his position at the School of War.

They are noisy but they are nice. Who would exchange the merry noise of children at play, for the childless house where the clock tick can be heard hour after hour in the dull silence? But there are a great many who would like to people the silent house with the children that fate has refused them. Fate is often in this case only another word for ignorance. Many a glad mother dates her happiness from the day she first began the use of Dr. Pierce's Favorite Prescription. It often happens that with the cure of female weakness and the establishing of the delicate womanly organs in sound health, the way is opened for the joy of motherhood. "Favorite Prescription" is a specific for the chronic ailments peculiar to women. It cures perfectly and permanently.

No other medicine can do for women so much as "Favorite Prescription." Do not therefore let any other medicine be palmed off on you as "just as good."

"Favorite Prescription" contains no alcohol, opium, cocaine or other narcotic. It is strictly a temperance medicine.

I had been a sufferer from uterine trouble for about three years, and the doctors that I consulted said I would have to go through an operation before I could give birth to children. writes Mrs. E. Evans, of Parsons, La. Box 41. "When I began to give up in despair I saw the advertisement of Dr. Pierce's medicine and thought I would give it a trial. I bought a bottle of Dr. Pierce's Favorite Prescription, and after taking it felt better than I had for years. It improved my health and I had taken one-half of the bottle. After taking four and a half bottles I gave birth to a bright baby girl who is now four months old and has not had a day of sickness. She is as bright as can be."

A woman's complexion often suffers because of poisonous accumulations in the system. Dr. Pierce's Pleasant Pellets remove these accumulations and cleanse the complexion. They regulate the stomach, liver and bowels.

of War, which, he declared, was evoked by hearing that no Jew were wanted on the General Staff. With the testimony of another minor witness, the session was then concluded.

#### THE TESTIMONY.

Rennes, Aug. 23.—Controller Roy, the first witness, gave his impressions of Dreyfus, which harmonized with those of the Generals who have already testified. But the witness was unable to give a single specific fact to substantiate his impressions. He referred to Dreyfus's alleged boastfulness of his money and the prisoner's irregular attendance at his office.

After Dreyfus had rebutted one or two of this witness's statements, Major Du Chatelet was called. He described the alleged confidences of Dreyfus in regard to women and gambling. Maitre Demange expressed surprise at the fact that the witness had not mentioned this at the court martial of 1894, to which Major Du Chatelet replied: "What! Here was a man accused of the most heinous crimes, and you think I ought to have retained his confidences in regard to women and gambling. Nonsense!"

Dreyfus briefly corrected some of Du Chatelet's statements, and then M. Dreyfus took the stand. He testified as to how he was introduced to Dreyfus by a certain M. Bodson, at whose house the witness afterward dined in company with Dreyfus and a German attaché, whose name he did not remember. M. Dreyfus said he was greatly astonished at the "suspicious familiarity" between the attaché and Dreyfus, and that, perceiving they disapproved of his presence, M. Dreyfus ceased his visits to M. Bodson. When the latter asked the reason for this, saying, according to the witness, that Dreyfus was the friend and even the lover of his wife, and asking witness's advice as to how to get rid of her, witness asked M. Bodson if he had proofs, and Bodson is said to have replied: "Proofs? Yes, I have even proofs enough to drive Dreyfus out of the French Army." Witness, however, was unable to learn what M. Bodson referred to.

A WITNESS'S CHARACTER IMPEACHED.

M. Labori, after questioning the character of M. Dreyfus, asked the Government Commissioner if he had made inquiries on the subject from the police of Coutances, to which Major Carrière replied: "That is a strange request."

M. Labori replied: "Everything is strange in this case, and the testimony of this witness is by no means the least strange."

When he was pressed to describe more clearly the alleged German attaché, M. Dreyfus replied that he did not know his name, but was told he was attached to the German Embassy.

M. Labori—Was he a military or a civil attaché?

M. Dreyfus—I do not remember. I do not know. Let Maitre Labori put himself in my place (laughter), and he will see the difficulty of remembering the name of a stranger he met thirteen years ago.

M. Labori—If I was unable to give his name I should not come here to testify. So, here is another Beaupaire witness, who knows nothing, yet testifies against the prisoner without being able to substantiate his allegations. The court will draw its own conclusions.

Dreyfus protested excitedly against the testimony of M. Dreyfus, who is a Parisian friend of M. De Beaupaire; but Colonel Jouaust exhorted him to be calm, promising the prisoner a chance to reply. This arrived soon afterward and Dreyfus thundered out:

"I won't speak here of M. or Mme. Bodson except to say that my relations with Mme. Bodson ceased in 1893 or 1897, since when I have never seen her. I wish simply to assert that the witness is lying. I never dined at M. Bodson's with any civil or military attaché. The matter must be cleared up. People must produce definite facts here, and not mere title tattle. The name of the person with whom I am alleged to have dined must be ascertained. It must be known here who is lying and who is speaking the truth."

#### REFUSES TO SEEK THE TRUTH.

The Government Commissioner—it must be understood that I must refuse to undertake the inquiry Maitre Labori suggests with reference to M. Dreyfus.

M. Labori—The Government Commissioner must not think any one intends to be disrespectful to him. But I have received information that the criminal authorities of Coutances are able to give interesting information in regard to M. Dreyfus. If I write to the public prosecutor, he will not reply to me. But if the Government Commissioner refuses my request, I will apply to the President, who is here solely concerned with the demonstration of the truth. I will beg him to be the interpreter of this respectful request. I know better than any one how much greater than mine is the position of the Government Commissioner.

M. Dreyfus having supported M. Labori's request, Colonel Jouaust announced that he would carry it out if he could legally do so.

When this incident concluded the trial again became utterly monotonous. Major Le Rond, a professor at the Military School, described his relations with Esterhazy and Picquart, telling how Esterhazy attended the artillery maneuvers of 1894 and 1896, and touching upon Picquart's subsequent inquiry as to whether, in 1894, Esterhazy could have obtained secret documents relating to new inventions, to which the witness replied in the negative.

Major Le Rond also said that when Colonel Picquart questioned him in 1896 as to the possibility of Esterhazy's possessing knowledge of artillery matters, the witness replied that Esterhazy seemed anxious to learn something about artillery, but his questions, while displaying intelligence and alertness of mind, showed comparatively little acquaintance with the subject. Esterhazy, he added, could only have consulted the Firing Manual through the witness, and had he done so his action, though not irregular, would have remained in the Major's memory.

The Major added that during this interview Picquart said he spoke on behalf of the Minister of War. "Colonel Picquart's manner in speaking of Esterhazy left me," he said, "no little doubt that proofs of Esterhazy's guilt existed that I asked if he had been arrested or was about to be taken into custody. Colonel Picquart replied that he had not yet obtained positive proof, but had the gravest presumptions."

Here Colonel Picquart jumped up and denied mentioning espionage to Major Le Rond, or that he spoke on behalf of the Minister of War. But the Major adhered to his statements, and asserted that Picquart's memory was playing him false.

ESTERHAZY'S CORRESPONDENCE.

At this juncture Colonel Jouaust announced that it was Esterhazy's turn to speak, but that, as he was not present, the testimony which he gave before the Court of Cassation would be read. The clerk of the court, accordingly, read to an attentive audience Esterhazy's deposition as already published in April last.

The reading of Esterhazy's deposition, in which there was nothing new, occupied an hour, during which the audience devoted most of its attention to M. Labori, whose appearance denoted no diminution of energy. The pallor which was noticeable in this face yesterday was replaced by a ruddy glow, though there were signs that he was suffering occasionally excruciating twinges. Still, his geniality and good humor did not diminish.

After a brief adjournment, M. Labori asked that three letters addressed by Esterhazy to the President of the Republic be read. The following is the first of these letters, published early in April last:

My house is illustrious enough in the annals of French history and in those of the great European causes for the Government of my country

to take care not to allow my name to be dragged in the mud. I address myself, therefore, to the Emperor of Germany, the President of the Republic, and I ask him to put an end to the scandal, as he can and ought to do.

I should have the sorrow not to be listened to by the supreme head of my country, my precautions are taken for my appeal to reach the ears of my heraldic chief, to the sovereign of the Esterhazy family, the Emperor of Germany, the President of the Republic, and I ask him to put an end to the scandal, as he can and ought to do.

In his second letter Esterhazy said:

I am at bay, and compelled to use all means in my power. A generous woman who warned me of the horrible plot woven against me, the friends of Dreyfus, with the assistance of Colonel Picquart, has since been able to procure for me, among other documents, the photograph of a paper which she succeeded in getting out of that officer. This paper, stolen in a foreign legation by Colonel Picquart, is most compromising for certain diplomatic personages. If I neither obtain support nor justice, and if my name comes to be pronounced, this photograph, which is to-day quite safe abroad, will be immediately published.

#### IN THE THIRD LETTER HE SAID:

This document is protection for me, since it proves the scoundrelism of Dreyfus, and is a danger for my country because its publication, with the fac-simile of writing, will force France to humiliate herself, to declare war. You, who are above empty quarrels, in which my honor is at stake, do not leave me under the obligation of choosing between two alternatives equally horrible. Compel Pontius Pilate of politics to make a clear, precise declaration instead of maneuvering to retain the votes of friends of Barabbas. All letters that I have written will shortly reach the hands of one of my relatives, who has had the honor of this summer to receive two Emperors. What will the whole world think when it learns of the cowardly, cold cruelty with which I have been allowed to struggle in my agony without help, without advice? My blood will be upon your heads.

#### GONSE TAKES THE STAND AGAIN.

General Gouze said that he desired to reply to Esterhazy's statements. During the course of his observations, the General said that Esterhazy's allegation that he was the right hand man of the General Staff was absolutely false.

The Mont Souris interview, General Gouze continued, occurred in July, 1898. "But," he added, "as Major Du Paty de Clam and Lieutenant Colonel Henry left General De Boissière and myself in the dark in regard to their movements, it was only by chance I heard of it from M. Gribelin."

"Anonymous letters received in October, 1897, announced that a campaign was being organized against Esterhazy. It was proposed to send Esterhazy an anonymous letter telling him to keep quiet, and do nothing. But the Minister of War refused to sanction it."

The General positively maintained that Esterhazy was never instructed in regard to what he should say at the inquiry conducted by General Pellieux, and, General Gouze added, the assertions of Esterhazy on this subject were utterly devoid of truth.

General Gouze proceeded to refer to his avoidance of Esterhazy during the Zola trial. "I considered him to be a compromising person," said the witness, "and I was not wrong. If Esterhazy was permitted to go free at the time of the judicial inquiry, it was by order of General Saussier, who would not accept the advice of the General Staff, nor of the officers under him, however high their rank."

"It was Major Du Paty de Clam alone who compromised the entire Headquarters Staff by his imprudence. (This caused a sensation in court.) If I now say so for the first time, it is because the case against Du Paty de Clam has been dismissed. I could not have spoken earlier without seeming to accuse a prisoner."

#### AN EXPLANATION BY GONSE.

The General then attempted to explain the intervention of the headquarters staff in the choice of Esterhazy's witnesses at the time of his prosecution by Colonel Picquart. The witness said he was convinced that Du Paty de Clam was only connected with the late Lieutenant Colonel Henry, and not with Esterhazy. In conclusion, General Gouze said:

"Colonel Henry (I regret to have to speak of the dead) was greatly in the wrong in sending Gribelin to the Mont Souris interview. Gribelin had not been there if I had known it, and I had not been told."

M. Labori next asked that the dossier in the Tavernier inquiry in the case of Du Paty de Clam should be produced, whereupon the Government Commissioner said: "I ask that the request be refused." Replying to counsel, the Commissioner said he hoped Du Paty de Clam would be able to appear in a few days.

M. Labori said that he was greatly surprised that Du Paty de Clam had sent Esterhazy documents of which the former only ought to have had official cognizance. Did General Gouze prove Du Paty de Clam's action? Did he defend the machinations of Du Paty de Clam?

General Gouze—Never. Du Paty de Clam was headstrong and excitable.

M. Labori—But General Gouze initiated certain steps. Were there not conferences at which there were discussions as to what was to be done for Esterhazy?

General Gouze—There were no such conferences. It is absolutely untrue. These tales are always being repeated. I do not accept the insinuations.

M. Labori—There are no insinuations. We are talking of statements made by Du Paty de Clam.

#### DU PATY DE CLAM'S WORK.

After this M. Labori said that he desired to know whether General Gouze did not consider himself in some measure responsible for the proceedings of Du Paty de Clam. The General replied in the negative, and added that he was conscious that he had always done his duty. The witness admitted, however, that Du Paty de Clam was not altogether innocent of a share in the appearance of the "Dixie" article, which appeared in the "Libre Parole," and gave the public the first information regarding the character of the secret dossier and the intrigues against Colonel Picquart.

When General Gouze was asked what he thought of Du Paty de Clam's interviews with Maitre Tezenas, Esterhazy's counsel, General Gouze replied: "Esterhazy was a sort of special prisoner. He retained his liberty, not because he was under the protection of the General Staff, but because General Saussier so ordered it."

Therewith M. Labori remarked that General Saussier acted in this manner because he had been deceived by the headquarters staff in regard to Esterhazy, adding: "That is a point which is very important to emphasize."

The General admitted there were two interviews between Du Paty de Clam and M. Tezenas, after which, witness said, he ordered them to stop.

General De Boissière at this point took occasion to defend himself again. "I ask leave," he said, "only to tell the Court that I give the most absolute contradiction to Esterhazy's evidence." Then, turning to counsel for the defense, the General added: "If I were not here as a witness I would ask permission to say, in regard to these falsehoods, (that I despise them and repel them with the scorn they deserve.) This statement caused a great stir."

#### TESTIMONY OF MME. PAYS READ.

The testimony given by Mme. Pays, the friend of Esterhazy, before the Court of Cassation, was then read by the clerk of the court, as the witness did not appear when her name was called.

General Lebelin de Dionne, Governor of the Military College, then testified to Dreyfus's character at college. The prisoner, he said,

displayed great intelligence, but had a deplorable temper. He recalled a remark of Dreyfus that the people of Alsace-Lorraine would be much happier under German rule than under the rule of France.

The prisoner, referring to the testimony of General Lebelin de Dionne explained that during his first year at the Military College he attained very high marks, that the second year he almost held his place, when he heard that a member of the Examining Board had declared at a Board meeting that, without knowing the pupils, he put mark 5 opposite the name of Dreyfus, simply because he did not want a Jew on the headquarters staff. The prisoner thought that his protests against this would therefore be readily understood.

Regarding his alleged remarks about Alsace-Lorraine, Dreyfus declared that the statement was the very opposite of his real sentiments.

M. Lanquety, a mining engineer of Boulogne, who told the Court of Cassation that he had seen Dreyfus at Brussels during the summer of 1894, followed. The witness said that he could not now swear as to when he saw Dreyfus there. The prisoner, rising, declared that it was in 1895, at the time of the Amsterdam exhibition, adding that that was the only time he visited Brussels.

"I met you, M. Lanquety," said Dreyfus, "at a restaurant in the St. Hubert Arcade. We exchanged a few words." M. Lanquety admitted that the prisoner's statement was true. The court then adjourned.

#### PANIZZARDI MAY TESTIFY.

London, Aug. 24.—Official permission to appear at the Rennes court martial, if cited, has been granted, according to the Rome correspondent of "The Daily Mail," to Colonel Panizzardi, former Italian Military Attaché in Paris, who recently denied, in a communication to the "Figaro," the statement of General Roget, in his evidence at Rennes, that Panizzardi addressed a report to Signor Resman, former Italian Ambassador to France, to the effect that Colonel Schwartzkoppen, former German Military Attaché in Paris, had relations with Dreyfus.

#### THE SCHNEIDER FORGERY.

Paris, Aug. 23.—The "Figaro" to-day publishes a letter from Colonel Schneider, the Austrian Military Attaché, supplementing his telegram declaring the letter of November 30, 1897, to be a forgery. He says:

On November 30 my opinion was absolutely contrary to that expressed in the document. The fixing of the date and my signature to the text constitute forgery, even in the case of a document which I am unable to judge without having seen the text, — but if the text itself be mine, written under another date.

#### LABORI TO PROSECUTE DRUMONT.

Rennes, Aug. 23.—Maitre Labori has decided to prosecute "La Croix," one of the leading Clerical organs, and "La Libre Parole," together with M. Drumont, proprietor and director of the latter paper, personally, for declaring the recent murderous attack upon him a "fake."

#### THE KAISER INTERESTED.

Berlin, Aug. 23.—Prince von Ledeburg, the German Ambassador to France, lunched with the Emperor to-day. It is inferred they discussed the Dreyfus affair.

#### "LE GRAND OCCIDENT DE FRANCE."

THE RESIGNED HOUSE IN PARIS—THE HEAD-QUARTERS OF THE ANTI-FREE MASONS OF "LE GRAND ORIENT."

It is not known generally that the house in which Guérin and his comrades are besieged in Paris is called "Le Grand Occident de France." In opposition to the Masonic Grand Orient, the Anti-Semite League, of which Guérin is the president, has declared from the start of the Dreyfus affair that the Free Masons were, like the Protestants, the friends and supporters of the Jews and of the Jewish capital, now on his second trial at Rennes. The ferocious M. Guérin has been recognized not only as the head of the Anti-Semite League, but also as the general delegate of the "Grand Occident" of France, a new order of the association which he has tried to organize during the last two years.

The regular and ancient order of Free Masons in France cannot be said to have taken any active part in an official manner in the bitter Dreyfus fight. But, of course, the French Masons have repeatedly, as individuals, manifested their sympathy for the cause of justice, and consequently for the revision of the sentence dictated with closed doors and without communication of the proceedings to the accused person by the court-martial in December, 1894. Still, the anti-Dreyfusards pretended that the close vote by which the Chamber approved the Ministerial programme of M. Waldeck-Rousseau and maintained in power the present Cabinet, which they represent as favorable to the Dreyfus cause, was obtained only through a Masonic maneuver. They say that at the critical moment M. Brisson, a high dignitary in the Masonic order, jumped to the tribune and delivered a speech in which he made with his hands over his head the mysterious sign of the "grande détresse" (great distress). On seeing this sign the few hesitating Masons in the Chamber obeyed the rules of their order, and understanding that the latter might be in peril if they did not heed M. Brisson's cabalistic indication, they voted as he required, in favor of the new Cabinet.

Another explanation by the anti-Dreyfusards of the equitable and sympathetic attitude of the Masons belonging to the Grand Orient of France is a discovery alleged to have been made recently. According to it, "l'Annuaire," or annual bulletin, of 1891 the Masonic Lodge counted among its members a man by the name of Alfred Dreyfus. That name had disappeared in the "Annuaire" of 1894. Was that "Brother" Alfred Dreyfus the artillery captain? His adversaries do not hesitate in answering yes, and they thus find on most explanations of the alleged intervention of M. Brisson in the Chamber.

The real grievance of M. Guérin and his anti-Semite followers against Freemasonry is that the order is tolerated in France, while the Patriots' League, the Anti-Semite League and other similar associations have to be authorized by the Government. A campaign has been made in the press and in public meetings under the direction of M. Jules Lemaitre, Jules Guérin and others, to get the authorities to apply to the lodges of Free Masons the law which is enforced against other associations. Petitions were circulated saying, among other things:

Whereas, Secret societies are forbidden by the law; that the association called Freemasonry is, in fact, by its statutes, a secret society; that the secret character has a particularly grave effect on the fact that Freemasonry affects to give orders to its members, to obey without question, and to elaborate by itself, and that its aim seems to be the absorption of public power. The Minister of Justice is respectfully requested to state the principle of equality of all citizens before the law in applying to the secret society called Freemasonry, Article XII of the Laws of 1888.

The writer of the above petition was M. Jules Lemaitre, who signs himself "President of the League of the French Country, which is not a secret one, and which has suffered already two condemnations."

The secretary general of the Grand Orient, M. Bergère, published a complete answer to these attacks. This former officer of the French Army said:

By a decree of January 11, 1882, we have been legally recognized and approved; consequently, we are not on the same line as the new societies, which are to be tolerated, and which have been incriminated. Under all régimes Freemasonry has attracted to itself the sympathy of the Government. It is the moral strength of its doctrines. We are constituted for the study of universal morals, as philosophers and not as politicians. We cannot be likened, therefore, to those various associations which under the name of Freemasonry attempt to perform combative and campaigns of a definite political character.

These declarations did not prevent M. Guérin from starting the "Grand Occident," in opposition to the "Grand Orient" of France. He placed the offices of the General Delegate in the Rue de Chabrol, in the house now besieged by the forces of the French Government.

The scandal caused by M. Guérin would not have lasted so long, though the dead statement was known as not having been a very fervent Freemason, as he was admitted in 1881, but he was "received" only in 1893, at Marseilles, and knew "the light" in the Lodge La Reforme. His anti-Freemasonry was not a genuine one, but a primary grade of "apprentice" above which he did not rise. His busy life prevented him from

being an active member of the order, and his presence in a Masonic lodge is not recalled except on the occasion of the initiation of Lattre, in the Lodge Clemente Amille, when Gambetta delivered a great speech.

#### GUERIN HOLDING OUT.

#### PREPARATIONS FOR A FIERY IMMOLATION.

#### BY THE BESIEGED ANTI-SEMITES.

Paris, Aug. 23.—The Guérinists are still holding out at the headquarters of the Anti-Semite League, which has been besieged since August 12 by the authorities, as a result of the recent disturbances here. All is quiet, but they have erected a fresh barricade of chairs and tables and have soaked these with petroleum, from which it is believed the besieged contemplate immolation.

A fireman remains constantly on duty outside the building.

#### RUMORED KILLING OF LOUBET.

Paris, Aug. 23.—A rumor was current in various newspaper offices late this evening that President Loubet had been assassinated at Rambouillet.

Subsequently the report was officially declared to be untrue.

#### TO INDORSE M'KINLEY.

#### PENNSYLVANIA REPUBLICANS WILL ADOPT STRONG RESOLUTIONS.

Philadelphia, Aug. 23 (Special).—Beyond the perfunctory assembling of the Republican delegates to the State Convention, at Harrisburg, to-morrow, in order to ratify the selection of John Hay Brown for Judge of the Supreme Court, Josiah R. Adams for the Superior Court and Lieutenant Colonel James E. Barnett for State Treasurer, the gathering will have National significance. For the last few days the Republican leaders have been busy with the preparation of resolutions, and the delegates of the State have been here comparing notes and reconciling sectional and individual preferences, with conspicuous success.

In referring to the Convention, Governor Stone said to-day to a Tribune correspondent:

"The Governor of a State represents the whole people, and therefore should have as little to do with the political conventions of his party as possible, but I can say this, that the names most prominently mentioned for nomination have been selected with remarkable unanimity. The friends of the many excellent would-be nominees naturally urged the interests they desired to see recognized, but became reconciled to the logic of the situation when it was presented to them in all its bearings. Any charges of forcing things are without foundation, for I have never seen greater unanimity among delegates in gratifying you, might say, into about what would be just. The eastern, central and western sections of the State are to be represented on the ticket."

United States Senator Penrose, in passing through here on his way from Washington to Harrisburg, said:

"The Republican Convention may be regarded as a send-off for the National campaign of 1900. The men who will be nominated by an overwhelming and probably unanimous vote are those who have been in every respect. Even those who have been somewhat off on some states does great injustice to the candidates. There were many candidates, and all could not be nominated; if they could be every one of them would receive a unanimous vote of course, I mean of the 'regular organization,' which simply means the almost overwhelming sentiment of the party."

The declarations of the Convention, besides their local features, will cover the National ground comprehensively. We are in favor of the policy of President McKinley and all that it means of honest finances and expansion, in the sense of holding on to all that we have gained in the way of additional territory by annexation or conquest, and a vigorous prosecution of the war in the Philippines. There are a few people in